

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: LOIZZO, ANTONIO; LOIZZO, ANTONIO

SERIAL NO.: 10/042,437

ART UNIT: 1746

FILED: January 10, 2002

EXAMINER: LOIZZO, A.

TITLE: METHOD TO OBTAIN A CLOTH SUITABLE FOR CLEANING ANY TYPE OF SURFACE

AMENDMENT "A"

Director of the U.S. Patent  
and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of March 29, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on May 29, 2004, please consider the following remarks:

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present remarks, previous Claims 1 - 10 have been canceled and new Claims 11 - 17 substituted therefor. Reconsideration of the rejections, in light of the forgoing amendments present remarks, is respectfully requested. The present amendments have been entered for the purpose of placing the application into a proper condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, it was indicated that Claims 1 - 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim

the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. Additionally, it was indicated that Claims 1 - 10 would be allowable if rewritten or amended so as to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In reply to the Official Action, Applicant has extensively revised the language of original Claims 1 - 10 in the form of new Claims 11 - 17. New Claims 11 - 17 express the original limitations in a more proper U.S. format, including proper antecedent bases and proper structural interrelationships throughout. Any indefinite terminology found in the original claim language has been corrected herein.

In particular, new independent Claim 11 expresses the limitations found in original Claim 1. The various steps associated with the “method of obtaining a cloth” are now positively recited. In particular, it is now specified in Markush format that the polymeric micro-fibers are selected from “the group consisting of polyamide, polyurethane, polyester and mixtures thereof”. Dependent Claims 12 - 16 reflect the limitations of original Claims 2 - 6 but express those limitations in a proper “method” format. New dependent Claim 17 reflect the limitations of previous dependent Claim 9. In view of the “indefiniteness” recitation by the Examiner, Applicant has canceled those limitations associated with dependent Claims 7, 8 and 10.


Based upon the foregoing analysis, Applicant contends that independent Claim 11 is now in proper condition for allowance. Additionally, those claims which are dependent upon Claim 11 should also be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the

claims at an early date is earnestly solicited. Since no new claims have been added above those originally paid for, no additional fee is required.

Respectfully submitted,

MAY 20 2004

Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John S. Egbert  
Reg. No. 30,627  
Andrew W. Chu  
Reg. No. 46,625  
Attorney for Applicant  
Harrison & Egbert  
412 Main Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(713)224-8080  
(713)223-4873 fax